MAOISM VERSUS CULTURE

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

B. BULATOV

MAOISM VERSUS CULTURE

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1970

C-88995

CONTENTS

The Yenan "Talks"	7
The Repression of Intellectuals	10
Reeducation Through Labour	15
Onset of the "Cultural Revolution"	18
A Substitute for Culture	21
Idolatry	24
The Fear of Intellectuals	28
Vulgarization	31
Pseudo-art	34
Mao Tse-tung's Views on Culture and Education	39
Onslaught Against World Culture	41
Destruction of Culture, Maoist Style	49
Amateurs in Place of Professionals	53
Lu Hsun Versus the Maoists	60
Outcome of Slanderous Propaganda	67

China has an ancient civilization. The Chinese were the inventors of paper and book-printing, the compass and seismograph, porcelain and gun powder. They compiled comprehensive historical chronicles and great encyclopaedias. Materialist philosophy developed in China in antique times. *Shih Ching*—the unique collection of poems and songs dated back many centuries B.C. China has a rich ancient literature and a rich tradition in the fine arts. The surviving monuments of ancient Chinese architecture continue to attract and inspire us. But in the last two three centuries cultural development in China lagged owing to the stagnation of feudal society and later to China's becoming a semi-colonial country.

Under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and Marxist thought, cultural development in China took a new turn and became a part of world revolutionary culture. In the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution of 1925-27 and after it, progressive intellectuals in China came to take part in the national-liberation struggle. Some of the most outstanding of these including Li Ta-chao and Chu Chiu-po mastered Marxism-Leninism and became

prominent Communist-internationalists. The early thirties saw a powerful upsurge of progressive literature and arts. Among the best known writers, painters and composers at this time were Lu Hsun, Mao Tun, Lao She, Pa Tsin, T'an Han and Chao Shu-li.

The Chinese Communist Party paid great attention to the question of cultural advancement, especially in the liberated areas. In the difficult conditions of the civil war and the Japanese invasion the Communists spared no effort in bringing culture to the peasants, soldiers and workers. However, a sizable segment of the intelligentsia remained in the grip of bourgeois ideology, and nearly 90 per cent of the people could neither read nor write.

It was thus natural that following the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic the Communist Party and government set two major tasks in the field of culture—the development of education and the reeducation of the old intellectuals. Considerable progress was achieved. But it could have been much greater if the country's cultural policy had not fallen under the control of Mao Tse-tung and his followers who distorted the Marxist-Leninist teaching on culture and cultural revolution.

The Maoists showed little genuine concern for culture and the intelligentsia. Instead, they began holding back cultural progress and launched one campaign after another against intellectuals, in the course of which the Marxist-Leninist principle of reeducating the old intelligentsia was grossly violated. Intellectuals were systematically subjected to persecution and harassment.

THE YENAN "TALKS"

Attacks on culture and the persecution of intellectuals in China are spurred on by the notorious "ideas" and "instructions" contained in Mao Tse-tung's "Talks" on literature and the arts which he delivered in Yenan in 1942.

In the "Talks" Mao Tse-tung juggled with Marxist terminology. He used a number of Marxist propositions taken, for example, from Lenin's works. He called for studying the Soviet experience in cultural development and for respecting cultural workers. He wrote: "Since China is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country with a backward culture, the intellectuals are particularly cherished as a great treasure... It is entirely right that we should value intellectuals, for without revolutionary intellectuals the revolution cannot succeed."[1]

But in practice these correct propositions were ignored.

Mao Tse-tung's "Talks" in Yenan were later declared "the acme of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics" and came to form the basis of China's entire cultural policy. But actually "Talks" boil down to a crude vulgarization of Marxism. This is clear to anyone who has considered them carefully.

Marxism regards culture as the sum total of spiritual wealth accumulated by society. "Proletarian culture," Lenin wrote, "... is not clutched out of thin air; it is not an invention of those who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge

[1] Mao Tse-tung. *Sel. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 32, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1956.

mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner and bureaucratic society... You can become a Communist only when you enrich your mind with a knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind."[1] In a socialist and communist society the cultural wealth created by previous generations should be multiplied many-fold. Otherwise, it is impossible to build communism and ensure the all-round development of the individual. Such is the Marxist conception of culture.

What is Mao's conception of culture as formulated in the "Talks"? It is clear that Mao does not stand for augmenting cultural wealth. His approach to culture is purely utilitarian. He speaks only of the need to acquire a minimum of general information, to create a minimum of "spiritual food" for the masses. By "spiritual food" Mao means "understandable to the people" works.

Of course, works of literature and art should be understandable to the people. But to reduce the role of literature and art to this level is ridiculous, to say the least. In China, where the majority of the population are illiterate, to demand that art and literature be "understandable" to the people means drastically lowering the nation's cultural level. Thus Mao Tse-tung's directives are objectively designed to preserve a state of cultural backwardness in the country. In fact, Mao denies the Chinese people their right to create and enjoy real art. Clearly, his instructions run counter to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on cultural development, which emphasizes the need to raise the people's cultural and aesthetical standards.

[1] Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 286.

Mao Tse-tung's attitude to the intelligentsia is based on a vulgarized conception of culture. He wrote in his "Talks": "In comparing intellectuals, not yet reeducated, with workers and peasants I came to realize that these intellectuals are slovenly..."[1] At that time, in 1942, there were very few such "reeducated" intellectuals in China, and thus the word "slovenly" was used to describe the overwhelming majority of the country's intellectuals.

Mao made many such absurd statements which show that he opposes the masses to the intellectuals. He urges intellectuals to "learn from the masses," but never says that the masses must learn from the intellectuals. The "Talks" set down strict rules for writers and artists, specifying what kind of characters should be depicted and what should not, which should be glorified, which criticized, etc.

This kind of guidance by injunction is profoundly alien to the Marxist approach to the arts. As Lenin pointed out, literature is the least susceptible of standardization, of being dominated by the majority, of being supervised and controlled. Thus Lenin never imposed his views on cultural workers or made dogmatic statements about cultural matters. Anatoly Lunacharsky, USSR People's Commissar for Education and a close associate of Lenin, wrote that "Vladimir Ilyich never made guiding principles out of his aesthetical likes and dislikes"[2] and recalled the following conversation he had with Lenin:

---

[1] Mao Tse-tung. *Sel. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 128.

[2] *Lenin on Literatite and Art*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1967, p. 260.

"'Well then, to sum up,' I said. 'Everything that is more or less sound in old art is to be safeguarded. . .'

"To this Lenin said: 'This puts it rather precisely, I think. Now try to bring it home to our audiences. . .'

"'Can I quote you?' I asked.

"'No, why? I don't claim to be an expert in the arts.'" [1]

Thus already in 1942 Mao Tse-tung in his Yenan "Talks" crudely distorted Marxist-Leninist concepts of culture. On the order of Mao and his henchmen, the "Talks" became the basis for China's cultural policy. Distortion became the regular practice. The bitter life in China today is a convincing proof of this.

THE REPRESSION OF INTELLECTUALS

Before the notorious "cultural revolution" was launched the Chinese authorities had carried out five mass scale campaigns to "reeducate" the intelligentsia: criticism of the film *Wu Hsün's Life* (1951), criticism of research on the classical novel *Dream of the Red Chamber* (1954), the struggle against Hu Feng and his "counter-revolutionary clique" (1954-55), the struggle against the "bourgeois Rightists" (1957), "the fifth great revaluation of values in literature and art" (1964).

The film *Wu Hsün's Life*, released in 1950, enjoyed great popularity and was praised in the press. In April 1951, there was a sudden change in official view regarding the film. It was revil-

[1] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, Progress Publishers, pp. 261-62.

ed in every way and called "ideologically harmful." *Jenmin Jihpao* said on May 20, 1951: "The problem raised by the *Wu Hsün's Life* concerns matters of principle. People like Wu Hsün... were not at all trying to shatter the feudal economic basis and its superstructure; on the contrary, they fervently propagandized feudal culture... Should we really glorify such base actions?"[1]

What was the issue? Who was this Wu Hsün who "propagandized feudal culture"? In what consisted his "base actions"? Wu Hsün lived in the last century. His father, a poor peasant, died when Wu Hsün was five years old. He led a miserable life, but he dreamed about school. He managed to put by some money and opened several schools with free tuition. Though he did not have an education himself he tried to give it to the children from poor families. For his work the government conferred on him various honourary titles. Such, in brief, was the story of Wu Hsün. The 110th anniversary of his birth was marked throughout China in 1949. Wu Hsün was praised for his humanism and called a distinguished enlightener. Then, all of a sudden, his educational work was considered "base actions."

Of course, there are many aspects to the activity of Wu Hsün and people like him, and they can be assessed differently. Much should be criticized. Wu Hsün was not a revolutionary and did not fight for the reshaping of society. But his efforts to bring education to the illiterate certainly deserve to be commended. Irresponsible name-calling is not a substitute for objective study. After all, how could Wu Hsün who lived in

[1] *Jenmin Jihpao*, May 20, 1951.

feudal China propagandize "proletarian culture"? No one in his right mind would expect him to do so. Then why did Mao Tse-tung and his adherents make such absurd demands of Wu Hsün?

The answer is simple enough. Mao and his yes-men wanted to carry out a large-scale purge among the intellectuals. In other words, they needed a pretext, which they found in the film *Wu Hsün's Life*. As it became clear in 1967, it was Mao Tse-tung himself who wrote an article for the *Jenmin Jihpao* and thus started the discussion on the film.[1]

In the beginning artists and professional people were required to comment on Wu Hsün and his "reformist activity." Later they were compelled to "talk frankly" about their personal views, innermost aspirations, professional plans and even about their private life. Out of fear of repressions, and of endangering the lives of their relatives and close ones, or possibly out of weariness over the incessant "criticism meetings" which were actually a sophisticated form of psychological torture, they "repented." But such "repentances" were meaningless. People simply thought up their "sins," "vices" and "heretical thoughts," which, of course, were not grave enough to cost them their freedom. For instance, some of them repented of "individualism" which meant that they "loved their wives and children more than anything else in the world." Normally, this might have evoked an incredulous smile from the listener, but it was tragic for the Chinese people.

"Repentances," however, did not save many intellectuals from reprisals, humiliating "public

[1] *Jenmin Jihpao*, May 26, 1967.

trials," which were often tantamount to professional death for the "defendants." Some were luckier—they were subjected to "reeducation," i.e., they were sent to the villages, industrial enterprises and military units in order to be "closer to the masses."

At first, such "reeducation" proved beneficial both to the intellectuals and the people. The former were engaged in more or less familiar activities: they taught peasants to read and write, conducted amateur art groups, etc. Certain writers and artists thus came to know the heroes of their future works. But eventually "reeducation through labour" was turned by the Maoists into a humiliating and cruel punishment: intellectuals subjected to "reeducation" were compelled to perform only physical work. But neither "reeducation" nor economic necessity required this. In China, as is well known, there is a tremendous surplus of labour, but an acute shortage of brain-workers.

Another anti-intellectual campaign, was the so-called struggle against the counter-revolutionary Hu Feng clique. It was also launched on order from Mao Tse-tung, whose "comments" in *Jenmin Jihpao* played a major role in starting the "criticism."

Hu Feng is an eminent poet, publicist and literary critic. He was close to the great Lu Hsun. During the anti-Japanese war he published the literary magazine *Chiyuyeh* ("July") whose contributors were Left-wing writers. At the First and Second All-China Congresses of literary and art workers Hu Feng was elected to the leading organs of the Writers' Union. Then, suddenly he was branded a "revisionist." Why?

"Every effort must be made," Hu Feng wrote,

"to master the heritage of international revolutionary literature and the great literature of critical realism."[1] Hu Feng was upholding the principles of socialist realism. He stood for revolutionary humanism and criticized compulsory "reeducation" of cultural workers through physical labour. Cultural workers, he said, can master Marxism-Leninism while practicing their profession. He also spoke of the need for "enhancing the role of Party leadership through ensuring conditions for creative work."[2] Herein lies the "revisionism" of Hu Feng.

But, of course, neither Hu Feng nor his associates propagated any "revisionism," though on certain questions they had expressed erroneous views. Their "revisionism" consisted in this: they ventured to call for the extensive use of the experience of cultural development in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, explained this experience and opposed it to the "ideas of Mao Tse-tung." Thus the reprisals against Hu Feng and his associates were basically an expression of anti-Sovietism.

A logical question arises: why was nothing said about Hu Feng's "revisionism" in 1954-55 when a fierce campaign was launched against him? Why was the question of his "revisionism" raised only several years later?

The answer is simple. In 1954-55 Mao Tse-tung and his group were not yet in a position to come out openly with anti-Soviet, anti-socialist views. They first needed a long period of "prepa-

---

[1] Hu Feng. *Views on Literature and Art*, Supplement to *Wen-i pao*, 1955, No. 1-2, p. 95.

[2] Ibid., p. 148.

ration," which meant discrediting and removing all prominent Marxists who were opposed to Mao Tse-tung's "directives" and stood for better relations with the socialist countries.

REEDUCATION THROUGH LABOUR

The "struggle against the Rightists" in 1957-58 did much harm to cultural development in China. Thousands of cultural workers were subjected to "reeducation through labour." They included the poet Ai Ching, writers Ting Ling, Chin Chao-yang, Liu Pin-yan, Liu Shao-tang, literary critics Feng Hsueh-feng, Chen Yun and others. The fate of many of them remains unknown. Meanwhile, the reprisals against them were "theoretically substantiated." Lu Ting-i, then Minister of Culture [also criticized later in the course of the "cultural revolution"—*B.B.*], said: "The profession of a writer is not only honourable but dangerous... since it can lead to individualism and liberalism."[1] Indeed, the profession of a writer, especially if he is a Communist, is very dangerous in China. The Chilean poet, Pablo Neruda, wrote in April 1964: "Speaking only about the Chinese writers whom I know personally, I would like to note that Ting Ling, the brilliant Chinese novelist and a member of the Board of the Chinese Writers' Union, has not long ago simply vanished. At first, she was sent to a people's commune where she washed dishes and slept on the floor. Later nothing was heard about her at all. But once this authoress—barefoot and with a baby

[1] *Jenmin Jihpao*. October 27, 1957.

in her arms and a rifle on the back—went together with the partisan detachments of the Chinese Communist Party, from Hunan to Kuangchou." After citing some more similar cases, Pablo Neruda added: "A Chinese leader who told me about this, put on a cold-blooded smile. But I was in no mood to smile, comrades."

Eminent literary workers, subjected to repressions even before the notorious "cultural revolution" started, were charged with numerous "deadly sins." These included "Rightist deviations," "painting distorted pictures of revolutionary realities in China," etc. These facts became known in the course of the "cultural revolution." The Maoists hate these writers for their loyalty to socialist realism, for their refusal to whitewash Chinese realities or glorify Mao, and, what is most important, for their being true friends of the Soviet Union and real admirers of Soviet literature.

The campaign of vulgarization and distortions covered up with talks about the "purity of proletarian culture," and of malicious attacks on genuine culture and science was growing. Mao Tse-tung and his yesmen were, on the one hand, getting rid of intellectuals not to their liking, and, on the other, forcing scientific and cultural workers to join the so-called big leap. The Maoists belittled the role of technical, scientific and artistic intellectuals in building up the country. Students were made to believe that their instructors were "bourgeois," whose teaching was not what it should be. With official encouragement students wrote "within a record time" "text-books" and "scientific works," which were immediately proclaimed "new discoveries" in science. Special-

ists were sent to the countryside for "reeducation," while their places were taken by "people's experts" most of whom lacked even a primary school education. Significantly, it was at this time that the Maoists began saying that the Soviet experience was "conservative," though new China benefited a great deal from it.

With Mao Tse-tung's blessing, Chou Yang put forward "a creative method," worked out by Mao himself, "of combining revolutionary realism and revolutionary romanticism." This method was to replace the method of socialist realism elaborated in the Soviet Union, which was considered incapable of reflecting "China's turbulent realities."[1]

What is the essence of this "new method"? First and foremost, it requires that writers pay less attention to everyday life. Instead, they should paint "a brighter future" which, according to the Maoists, is just around the corner. Meanwhile, a "big leap" in "people's art" was being artificially created. It was said that in Hsichuan Province alone four million poets created, within a short time, 78,500 million "works." "The experience of the old poets can be of little help to us," said Chou Yang, "the poems written by the masses are better than those written by poets."

In early 1959 there were signs that the more extreme measures connected with the "big leap" in culture and the "drive for people's songs" were being dropped. That was a logical result of the adventurist, voluntarist policy of Mao Tse-tung and his adherents. The "big leap," on which the Maoists counted to ensure their hegemony in the

[1] Jenmin Wensye, 1959, No. 1, p. 4.

world revolutionary movement, was a failure both in the economic and cultural spheres. The "brighter future" never came. Meanwhile millions of "art works" were forgotten, just as millions of home-made furnaces used all over China to cast iron of very poor quality were abandoned.

ONSET OF THE "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

Mao Tse-tung and his supporters, however, learned nothing from their failure. On the contrary, they persisted in their course of tearing China away from the other socialist states and establishing a military-bureaucratic dictatorship in the country. The course was objectively in contradiction with the development of a genuinely socialist culture. For a military-bureaucratic dictatorship has no need for culture, just as it has no need for Marxist intellectuals. It regards culture as a roadblock of fanning great-Hun chauvinism and boosting the Mao Tse-tung cult.

In 1962, the 20th anniversary of the publication of Mao Tse-tung's Yenan "Talks" was marked with a great deal of fanfare. In the autumn of the same year Mao Tse-tung and his supporters launched another offensive against culture and the intelligentsia. Education and the theatre were especially affected. Ideological "reeducation" was intensified, particularly in the higher schools. The soldiers were held up as examples for the rest to follow. As it became clear later, that was the beginning of the training of hungweipings. The most popular dramatic genre—the Peking ope-

ra—was "revolutionized." The classical repertoire was abolished and replaced by a few "approved" shows glorifying Mao Tse-tung. No more novels were published. Production of full-length films was stopped. Attacks on Soviet literature and art became more frenzied. They were followed by attacks on the culture of the other socialist countries and on progressive culture throughout the world. China was on the threshold of the "cultural revolution."

In the summer of 1966, the "great proletarian cultural revolution" was set in motion. "The struggle will last a long time if necessary," said the "16-Point Decision" on the "cultural revolution" adopted in August. "It will last from generation to generation," stated *Jenmin Jihpao.*

Today so much is known about the "great cultural revolution" that it is impossible to talk about it without putting the word "revolution" in quotes. But in the summer of 1966, many people wondered if the Chinese leaders had really decided to carry out a cultural revolution. Some recalled the Resolution of the 8th Congress of the CPC (1956) which read in part: "Every effort should be made to carry out a cultural revolution in our country: illiteracy should be eliminated in a planned manner, stage by stage; compulsory primary education should gradually be introduced throughout the nation... There should be no coercion and arbitrariness in dealing with questions of science and art. It is necessary to continue criticism of feudal and capitalist ideology. At the same time, it is necessary to know and master whatever is useful in the past culture of our country and in the culture of foreign countries. It is also necessary, with the help of the achievements of

contemporary science and culture, to put in good order all that is best in the cultural heritage of our country and to exert every effort in creating a new, socialist national culture."[1]

Some people wondered if the Chinese leaders had indeed decided to quit the "revaluation of values," as they called the campaigns against culture and intellectuals, and to pursue a policy so correctly and clearly formulated in the decisions of the CPC 8th Congress. The answer to this question soon became clear. Schools, closed at the outset of the "cultural revolution," never reopened, while "revolutionary pupils and students," acting on orders of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao, began wrecking libraries and museums, publishing houses and offices of professional unions, ancient shrines and architectural monuments, book and antique art shops. Intellectuals were dragged about in the streets in fool's caps, or subjected to endless questioning at "self-criticism meetings." On June 18, 1966 *Jenmin Jihpao* stated the aims of the "cultural revolution": "It is necessary to burn old textbooks contradicting the ideas of Mao Tse-tung... New textbooks must be based on the ideas of Mao Tse-tung... Mao Tse-tung's works must be a compulsory subject on the curricula of primary, secondary and higher schools." Three days later, Foreign Minister Chen Yi further defined the "cultural aspect" of the "revolution" then well underway: "Traditional culture and customs are bad for the spirit of our people. They must, therefore, be fully rejected, and their influence eradicated." This directive was put into

---

[1] *Proceedings of the 8th All-China Congress of the CPC, First Session*, p. 478.

effect with feverish speed. It became obvious that the purpose of the "cultural revolution" was to clear the way for establishing the cult of Mao Tse-tung, for tearing China away from the community of fraternal socialist countries, and creating a military-bureaucratic dictatorship in the country.

A SUBSTITUTE FOR CULTURE

Since genuine culture and cultural workers stood in the Maoists' way, it was to be expected that the first blow of the "revolution" and the "revolutionary" hungweipings was aimed at culture and intellectuals, especially Communists. Eventually the "cultural revolution" turned into a virtual political counter-revolution. Having made short work of distinguished Marxists among the intelligentsia, Maoists launched a large-scale offensive against the Party and the organs of people's power. In the course of this offensive they never stopped their attacks on culture and intellectuals. They sought to turn culture into a means for boosting Mao's cult and spreading his "ideas." In this connection a New China News Agency dispatch of October 15, 1966 is significant. Its heading, though somewhat long, is eloquent enough: "Revolutionary actors of Peking impersonate hungweipings on the stage." The dispatch reads: "The revolutionary proletarian spirit of the young Red Guards, their courageous drive forward, their readiness to act and carry out revolution have inspired the singers, dancers, actors, composers and ballet-masters of Peking theatres to perform a great number of songs, dan-

ces and skits. Noteworthy among them are *Flight to Peking, Hungweipings of Chairman Mao, We Saw Chairman Mao, Hungweipings Follow the Example of the National-Liberation Army* and *We Have Every Ground to Rebel and Make Revolution.* No explanation is needed here. A little over a year later, however, when the organizations of "the valiant young Red Guards" came to loggerheads with one another and placed the country on the brink of anarchy, thereby threatening the power of Mao Tse-tung himself, there was much less glorification of hungweipings on the stage. The hungweipings were replaced by "exemplary soldiers."

The theatre has always been immensely popular in China. It helped to bring art within the reach of the illiterate Chinese peasants. Travelling theatrical troupes performed even in the most remote villages. Many plays are known by heart by the ordinary people; personages from classical plays have, from time immemorial, been their national heroes. It is thus natural that China's rulers have always sought to use dramatic art to drive home their ideas of views. Before and during the "cultural revolution" Mao Tse-tung and his group paid particular attention to this art.

But the old classical repertoire could not be used to spread Mao's ideas. A directive was issued to reform the theatre and change its repertoire. The "reform" was effected by methods fully in accordance with the Maoist cultural policy. At an All-China review of Peking musical drama in the summer of 1964 Peng Chen, then Politbureau Member and Secretary of the CC CPC said: "Certain workers of the Peking opera theatre say that the staging of revolutionary plays [i.e. plays

glorifying Mao Tse-tung—*B.B.*] on contemporary themes means a campaign, a gush of wind. We would like to tell them that this is a powerful gush of wind which can blow off heads." Thus the main argument of the "reformers" consisted in the threat of physical persecution of those opposed to the "reform." But in an ironic twist of fate, in slightly more than a year a "powerful gush of wind" nearly blew off the head of Peng Chen himself.

The "reform" was carried out. The classical repertoire was replaced with a few hastily written plays praising the "great helmsman" and "exemplary soldiers"—"the tools of Mao Tse-tung." But nevertheless the "reform" failed to achieve its end. The "revolutionary plays" drew no audience. And producers and actors showed no enthusiasm about them, they definitely lacked military discipline, which the Maoists introduced everywhere, even in kindergartens. It was then decided, in the course of the "cultural revolution," to introduce army spirit and tough discipline into the theatre. On December 4, 1966, *Jenmin Jihpao* carried an account of a meeting of 20,000 representatives of "militant revolutionary groupings" of literary and art workers. The paper was "proud" to report that the four main theatre troupes in China—the first Troupe of Peking Opera, the Theatre of Peking Opera, the Central Musical Ensemble, the ballet troupe and the orchestra of the Central Theatre of Opera and Ballet—were made part of the army.

Participants in the same meeting heard other "happy news"—Chiang Ching, Mao's wife, was appointed "advisor for cultural work in the army." Hsieh Tang-chung, then Cultural Affairs

Chief of the Main Political Department of the Army, declared: "The decision to appoint Comrade Chiang Ching to this post reflects the tremendous concern of Chairman Mao, our most respected and beloved leader, for cultural work in the army. Our Comrade Chiang Ching has mastered to perfection the ideas of Mao Tse-tung and has a profound grasp of them..."

The famed Peking opera actor and stage producer Chou Hsinfang, persecuted by Maoists, committed suicide at this time.

The popular actress Hung San-nu also took her life in Kwangchou just a few days before Chiang Ching, who was the daughter of a wealthy merchant and one-time actress in Shanghai, was appointed military "advisor." Hung San-nu could not stand the physical and moral tortures inflicted on her by hungweipings and jumped to her death from the sixth floor of a building. Shortly before her suicide hungweipings sheared her hair and dragged her around the town in a fool's cap and with an insulting poster attached to her chest. After the actress's death the hungweipings issued a leaflet claiming that Hung San-nu committed suicide because she could not stand up to punishment.

IDOLATRY

In today's China everyone must see things from the Maoist standpoint. Any attempt to do otherwise brings punishment. The country is becoming increasingly isolated from the rest of the world, while Mao is being deified.

According to official data released in Peking,

by the end of 1968 China's publishing houses had put out 150 million sets of the four-volume *Selected Works* of Mao Tse-tung, 140 million copies of Mao's *Readers*, 740 million copies of quotations from Mao, 2,000 million copies of selected articles by Mao, and 96 million copies of Mao's poems. The total comes up to over 3,000 million copies—a figure unprecedented in the history of book-printing. But the Maoists are not satisfied with quantity. The book of quotations from Mao and his "works" are virtually pushed down the people's throats. People are required to memorize the poems of the "great helmsman," though the poems are written in a bookish literary language barely understandable to the ordinary reader. The Chinese literary magazine *Wensye Pinglun* declared: "The publication of the poems of Chairman Mao is a great and joyful even for the entire Chinese people and for the peoples of the entire world!... The poems are a literary treasure-house of the contemporary epoch."

While Mao's "works" are put out in millions of copies and praise is heaped upon them, the world classics translated into Chinese and published in China are being destroyed. Intense propaganda about China's exclusiveness, an attitude of contempt for the culture of other peoples, the encouragement of ignorance and violence have done much harm to the education of Chinese young people.

According to a leaflet prepared by the hungweipings of the Anhwei Technological Institute: "Old ideas, old culture, old manners and customs which we inherited from the old society, poison us, blunt our revolutionary will, corrode our ideological soul. Today... we cannot tolerate this any

more and cannot allow this rubbish to exist even one day in our great country." Thus the culture created by many generations is to be instantly destroyed. Another "revolutionary leaflet," issued by a Shanghai secondary school, calls for "burning and smashing such trash as photographs and playing records, no matter whom they belong to."

Such an "ideological" policy leads to predictable consequences. Many precious works of art were destroyed during the first stage of the "cultural revolution." Many objects of antique art are slipping abroad. Thirty-five thousand items have already gone to Japan. These include such works of national pride as manuscripts by the famed calligrapher of the Tang epoch Wang Wei, paintings by Li Ssu-hsun, Li King-lin, Mi Fei and others. A Japanese antiquarian, Kampo Harado, through the courtesy of the Peking authorities, has twice visited the Kwanchou fair where he purchased antique items for eleven dollars "apiece" on the average. It should be mentioned that after the 1949 revolution and prior to the "cultural revolution" no foreigner was allowed to take out of China any antique object more than a hundred years old.

It is the ideas and directives of the "helmsman" that foster such disregard for cultural values. The New China News Agency once carried the following directive of Mao: "Our workers in literature and art must completely reorganize themselves ideologically and psychologically." In other words, intellectuals must cease to be intellectuals. How people in China are being "reorganized" and "reeducated" is well-known throughout the world. If they somehow survive after several

years's hard labour in the Sinkiang deserts or the Yunan jungles, they seldom return to creative work as a result of moral and spiritual breakdown.

Any directive on the "complete reorganization" of professional people is carried out without delay. Many writers, scientists and artists, in order to avoid repressions, are always ready to repent of some mysterious sins. They even invent their "errors." The President of China's Academy of Science Kuo Mo-jo made the following "self-criticism": "In the light of the current criteria, my works [some of them are known throughout the world—*B.B.*] have no value and must be burned... Since workers, peasants and soldiers are studying the works of Chairman Mao, their creations are better than ours."

The well-known philosopher Feng Yu-lan said: "My egoism evokes horror... Since the liberation I have reappraised my conduct 135 times, but I did not do it profoundly enough."

Trying to outdo one another in propagandizing the directives of the "helmsman," the organs of the Maoist press often propagate views which can only be regarded as the product of extreme vulgarization.

"The Duke's aria from *Rigoletto* is ideologically poisonous, decadent, depraved, lewd, indecent and insulting to women," said *Nanfang Jih-pao.*

"Verdi, as a member of the bourgeois class, failed in his opera *La Traviata* to show Violetta a correct way out of her difficulties... He was not able profoundly and truthfully to expose the ugly ulcers of society, neither was he able to create a heroic character who would wage an

irreconcilable struggle against these ulcers," declared the magazine *Jenmin Inyueh* (People's Music). "To respect western music means to respect capitalism," the magazine said.

Once the teachers of the Peking University Music Department were told to stop teaching western classical music. When they refused all the teachers and students—400 in all—were sent to the countryside for "reeducation." This is far from being an isolated case.

THE FEAR OF INTELLECTUALS

The attitude of Mao Tse-tung and his yesmen to culture and intellectuals clearly shows their unprincipled stand and hypocrisy.

Once Mao Tse-tung wrote: "Without the participation of the intellectuals the revolution cannot achieve victory... All comrades in the Party must understand that a correct policy towards the intellectuals is one of the important conditions for the victory of the revolution."[1] Later he wrote: "All intellectuals who have performed meritorious service to the people should be esteemed as valuable assets of the nation and society"[2]

No one can question the correctness of these views. But the articles containing these views also express contradictory thoughts that give cause for apprehension. "As a matter of fact, many so-called intellectuals are, relatively the least knowledgeable," wrote Mao Tse-tung in 1945. Did Mao Tse-tung have in mind class consciousness or po-

---

[1] Mao Tse-tung. *Sel. Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 299-300.
[2] Ibid., p. 32.

litical aptitude? Or was he speaking only of bourgeois intellectuals who did not associate themselves with the revolution?

No. Mao Tse-tung had in mind the revolutionary intellectuals whom he mistrusted. Twenty years later Mao Tse-tung expressed this mistrust openly and clearly. In July 1965, he had a long talk with the French Minister of Culture Andre Malraux. In his book *Anti-Memoirs* Malraux recalls the following conversation with Mao.

"Is opposition in the country still strong?" he asks Mao.

"There is still the national bourgeoisie, *intellectuals,* etc. They have off-spring..."

"Why intellectuals?"

"They have anti-Marxist ideas."

Actually, one of the chief aims of the "cultural revolution" was to attack Marxist intellectuals. On Mao's order, Professor Hou Wai-lu, the translator of *Das Kapital* into Chinese, was publicly denounced. Professor Li Ta, a philosopher and participant in the CPC First Congress, was subjected to ruthless hounding. Thousands of eminent Party intellectuals were defamed, removed from office, thrown into prisons or concentration camps. Even the dead were not left alone. Maoists started besmirching the names of Chu Chiu-po, a distinguished Party leader who sang the *Internationale* as he met his death at the hands of Kuomintang gendarmes; Hou Chi, the famous communist writer shot by Kuomintang men in Shanghai, and many more.

It is clear that Mao and his henchmen hate the entire intelligentsia. They especially fear intellectuals who are Marxists and Party members. The reason is not far to seek. The Maoists fear all those

who, owing to their education, intellect and Marxist thinking, are capable of critically assessing the so-called "ideas" of Mao Tse-tung.

This shows that Mao and his supporters who earlier spoke about respect for intellectuals are unprincipled and hypocritical men. But what was said earlier by them is never recalled in China now. Publicity is being given to other pronouncements by Mao. Here is an example.

In 1967, the hungweiping press in Peking quoted Mao as saying: "The course of studies can be cut by half... During the Ming dynasty, things went well only under two emperors—Tai-tsy and Cheng-tsy. One of them did not know how to read, whereas the other knew only a few words. Later, under Chia-Chin, *intellectuals* came to power. But things did not improve... Reading many books makes a poor emperor..." In other words, culture and education are obstacles to progress. This is ridiculous, but revealing. Mao and his toadies defame and discredit the intelligentsia and call for its liquidation as a social stratum. How else is one to understand Mao's directive ordering the intellectuals "completely to reorganize themselves ideologically and psychologically"?

These are not mere words. There is definite evidence that steps have been taken in China for liquidating the intelligentsia. The number of intellectuals who have fallen victim to the new policy is growing. Foreign correspondents reported the suicide of Lao She, author of the world-renowned *Rickshaw Boy*. The famous writer Mao Tun, who had for many years been Chairman of China's Writers' Union and Minister of Culture, was denounced. Chao Shu-li, Chou Li-po (the aut-

hor of the remarkable novel *Storm*), Li Pai-yu. Shao Chuan-lin and many other writers are being basted and harassed. Among those blacklisted are playwright Hsia Yen, formerly Vice-Minister of Culture, the noted composers Ho Lu-ting and Mao Ko, the popular actor Chou Hsing-fang, the famous painters Tsai Jo-hung and Hua Tsun-wu, the economist Sun Yeh-fang (now in prison), the prominent historian Chiang Po-chiang, and many others.

Those cultural workers who were not imprisoned, exiled or sent to concentration camps are subjected to all kinds of humilation; the aim is to break them down morally and drive them to suicide. Many eminent intellectuals including Ma Yin-chu, formerly Rector of the Peking University, and a whole number of scientists, university professors, artists, actors and writers are forced to work as garbage collectors.

VULGARIZATION

The Maoists' attitude towards culture, science and art is in no way different from their attitude towards intellectuals.

Take philosophy, for example. Marxism-Leninism has always attached great importance to it. Here is a quotation from *Jenmin Jihpao* dated January 7, 1965: "Many philosophical works have appeared whose authors are workers, peasants and soldiers... Principles which seem difficult to grasp in philosophy books become easy to understand in their works. Many of our philosophers are far benind these workers, peasants and soldiers."

It seems that there is no need for philosophers since the job can be done better by peasants and soldiers. With all respect to soldiers and peasants, such proposition is sheer demagogy. Philosophy is the science of all sciences. Its elaboration requires extensive knowledge and, therefore, remains the prerogative of scholars and those political leaders who were trained in the field.

The reason behind such a proposition is clear. It is the intention of the Mao group to monopolize philosophy, and thus it becomes necessary to silence the philosophers for a long period of time, if not for good. In the course of the "cultural revolution" many distinguished Marxist philosophers, among them Yang Hsien-chen and Feng Din, were defamed and removed from office.

Any philosophical thought in China today emanates from Mao Tse-tung and two or three of his closest associates. Perhaps Mao Tse-tung can rightfully claim to be the supreme philosopher in China today? Judge for yourselves. Mao has put forward a thesis—"one is divisible by two"—according to which any solution of a contradiction immediately and unavoidably breeds another contradiction. This led Mao to conclude that revolution in a socialist and even communist society is inevitable.

This is crude vulgarization of Marxist philosophy. Such "conclusion" of Mao conceals far-reaching political aims. Its purpose is to "justify" the anti-socialist course of his group, to provide "an objective necessity" for carrying out regular mass-scale "purges" in the country and of the Party and for getting rid of the real and alleged opponents of the military-bureaucratic dictatorship to keep people in constant state of fear. By

this "conclusion" the Maoists also seek to justify their splitting policy in the international communist and working-class movement, to slander the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which are allegedly "bogged down in revisionism" and "slipping back to capitalism."

Let us take another example of Mao's philosophizing. According to Mao, any action is preconditioned by a kind of chain process: a subjective factor giving way to ideas which in turn give way to "revolutionized consciousness." This proposition is the basis of the Maoist thesis that "politics is the commanding force." Mao Tse-tung regards socio-economic reality as a "sheet of clean paper" on which a "great personality", meaning himself, can draw any pictures. It is obvious that such purely subjectivist views have nothing in common with Marxist philosophy.

On aesthetics, the theory of literature and art, *Wen-i pao* ("Literary Newspaper") said (No. 12, 1962): "The depiction of an average hero reflects the bourgeois view of literature." A Maoist critic, Li Chun, told Chinese writers and artists that if they should depict a Party member they must make sure that the hero met all the eight criteria contained in Mao's "Instructions." As a result, the heroes of Chinese literary works and works of art are all "supermen." Everything human is alien to such heroes. And they invariably speak the language of editorials and articles by the deified Chairman Mao.

The "theory that one should write about truth" is, according to the chief army paper *Chiefang-chiun pao,* a revisionist view of creative work. "It is necessary," the paper said, "to reorganize the literary and art workers... Literary style

must be improved... There is a need for a greater number of short articles accessible to all... One must study Chairman Mao's works all one's life, make revolution all one's life and conduct ideological self reeducation all one's life."

It should be noted that such directives, which one must carry out or face inhuman punishment, have produced some "results." For instance, a serviceman by the name of Chin Ching-mai has written a novel entitled *Song of Ouyan Hai.* President of the Academy of Sciences Kuo Mo-jo described it as an "epoch-making novel": "The author has presented a true image of Ouyan Hai and vividly reflected the ideas of Chairman Mao... The author succeeded in encompassing in his story all the political directives issued by the Party up to 1962 and almost all the ideas of the Chairman." This appraisal speaks for itself.

PSEUDO-ART

The state of the drama is no better. Take, for instance, the play *Red Banner Is Flying Everywhere.* Its hero—a seriously wounded metallurgical worker—is hospitalized. "I am not afraid to die," declares the bed-ridden hero. "My wife and children are provided with all the necessities. But what worries me most of all is . . .the smelting furnace... Steel... We are outstripping Britain... we are outstripping America [the action took place during the 'big leap' period—*B.B.*]... I cannot die without making sure that my furnace..."

No less ridiculous is the play *Chairman Mao's Soldier.* Its hero is a pseudo-legendary soldier by the name of Lei Feng. "He scrupulously followed

Chairman Mao's directives in everything" and died as he was unloading firewood. He left behind a diary filled with hysterical declarations of boundless love for and devotion to the "reddest sun." The heroes of the play appear before the audience against the background of an enormous cloth bearing these words in gold: "Learn from Comrade Lei Feng!" These words belong to Chairman Mao. Two heroes carry tommy-guns, while two other hold the ubiquitous book of Mao's quotations. A fifth hero raises high above his head the "diary of the exemplary soldier." The play has no plot; it consists of hours of chanting quotations from the "reddest sun." Sometimes the chanting is interrupted by commentaries. Again and again the idea is forced on the audience that Mao's utterances provide answers to all questions and that the book of quotations from the "great helmsman" makes life easy and smooth.

The commentaries deal mostly with the "revisionist" striving for material well-being. The audience is admonished by a chorus: "First you walked barefoot. Then you put on rag slippers, and then—rubber shoes. This time you may wish to sport leather shoes, or even high boots. What will become of you in this process of bourgeois degradation?"

The Chinese press reported that Chairman Mao watched the show "with delight." One wonders. The "great helmsman" is known to be a great Sybarite. He likes fine wines, good cigarettes and, what is more, Chinese classical art. The walls of the room where Mao works, Malraux writes, are hung not with paintings in the style of Chinese ultra-realism of the sixties, but with paintings of

antique times. This is understandable. After all, God sees what the mortal does not see...

"What will become of you in this process of bourgeois degradation?" Down with trivial everyday cares! The ideas of the "great helmsman" will take the place of a piece of bread or a bowl of rice. Learn from Lei Feng! He picked up and kept every rusty nail, for he remembered every minute of his life Mao's calls for "thrift." Learn from those who are like Lei Feng, for instance, a Wang Pao-chuan, an army chef, lauded by *Yunan Jihpao*. Follow the example of Wang Pao-chuan! During thirteen years of service he never took a day off, never bought a single pair of shoes, or socks. Thus reasonable thrift is replaced with primitive ascetism having nothing in common with revolutionary morality. This is how the Chinese people are being conditioned to living in poverty, which is caused largely by the disastrous, adventurist "leaps."

The Maoists are zealously promoting this kind of pseudo-art, their aim being to bring up "exemplary soldiers of Chairman Mao" who are supposed to be fearless. "I recall", writes J. Vidal, "how in 1960 in Peking I happened to see a film about the liberation of Shanghai... A trench, straight as a string, is in the foreground. There are close-ups of People's Liberation Army soldiers. They smile, flashing their teeth. They look spick and span. Bombs burst at some distance. Between the soldiers and the smoke from explosions are straight rows of bright flowers. That was 'realism combined with revolutionary romanticism,' which is very much the vogue in China today—on the stage, on the screen and in the novels. In fact, that makes up a kind of 'aesthetics',

or rather a vapid mixture of frank vulgarity with some kind of inevitable revolutionary 'superman' who seems to have overpowered all foes beforehand."[1]

One cannot but agree with J. Vidal. It should be noted, however, that such presentation of actual events, such "documentary" films which ignore real facts have failed to produce an "overwhelming" effect on the people, contrary to the expectations of the Maoists. War does not mean joy or flowers, or jingoistic shouts about victory. War means blood, suffering and bitterness of setbacks, even if temporary. This pseudo-art of the Maoists is sure to fail in nurturing "fearless soldiers of Chairman Mao." Soldiers, especially "fearless" ones, are brought up on the examples of genuine heroism.

This pseudo-art is a logical product of Mao's "constructive directives." According to these "directives" imperialists and "reactionaries of all hues" are nothing but "paper tigers," which can be fought against the background of flowerbeds and with a smile. "Documentary" films have been produced in China showing manoeuvres in the conditions of atomic warfare: while atomic bombs burst melting everything around, the "exemplary soldiers of Chairman Mao" continue to press ahead through blasts, smiling and shouting quotations from Mao.

Mao and his followers are not satisfied with merely making the arts serve their political ends. In trying to reduce culture and art to their lowest, most primitive level, the Maoists also seek to li-

---

[1] J. Vidal. *Where the Mao Tse-tung Group Is Leading China To.* Moscow, 1967, p. 126.

quidate art as a source of profound ideas and feelings which are unavoidably incompatible with Maoism.

The whole situation reminds one of Andersen's tale about the naked king. Swindling tailors took him around the streets in his birthday suit. The crowds enjoyed the sight thoroughly but kept silent for fear of punishment. But no sooner had someone in the crowd shouted "Look, the king is naked!" than everybody burst out laughing, and nobody was afraid any longer of saying it out loud and pointing to the naked king. In China it is the Marxist intellectuals who could and should have exposed Mao's ideological and political bankruptcy and spoken out loudly for everybody to hear: "Look, great people of China, what kind of idol has been forced on you!" Such voices, though scattered, were in fact heard. Those were the voices of Teng To, Wu Han and many other honest Marxists among the intellectuals, who pointed out, though in a comouflaged form, the deplorable results of the Maoist "big leap" and the pernicious nature of the adventurist policies. But brutal punishments were inflicted on these Marxist intellectuals and thousands of persons of like mind. Teng To is rumoured to have committed suicide; the fate of Wu Han is not known. Any attempt at openly criticizing Mao Tse-tung and Maoism was suppressed. Under the slogan of "overthrowing old authorities" certain people were marked out for physical destruction or moral maiming. Apparently, the Maoists need an enormous vacuum in the spiritual life of the 700-million people who have behind them a long tradition of free-thinking. This vacuum is needed to ram Mao Tse-

tung's ideas into the consciousness of the average Chinese. The ideas of the deified Chairman are to dominate over everything, including, of course, the spirit and letter of Marxism which was used as a tactical weapon by the Chinese nationalists who have gathered around Mao. They have already departed from the spirit of Marxism and most likely will do the same with its letter pretty soon.

Mao's nationalistic ideas require such a vacuum; hence the objective need to liquidate the Chinese intelligentsia. But there is a subjective factor, too, which is of considerable significance. This is Mao's profound hatred for intellectuals in general. It is matter of feeling, and not the result of reasoning. This subjective hatred makes the implementation of the "objective need" a pleasant pastime and brings something like sadistic pleasure. The self-flagellation of "repentent" cultural workers is shocking indeed.

MAO TSE-TUNG'S VIEWS ON CULTURE AND EDUCATION

Mao's views on culture and education were clearly stated in his talk with a group of medical workers on June 20, 1965 [part of the talk was published in the Peking medical workers' paper *Hanyi Chanpao* on March 17, 1967]. Urging a reform in medical education the "great helmsman" declared: "Studying much is absolutely unnecessary. How long did Hua To study? [an eminent physician in ancient China—*B.B.*] What about Li Shih-chen who lived in the Ming dynasty?... It is not necessary that medical schools

accept only graduates of secondary or incomplete secondary schools. Three years of training is enough for primary school graduates. Skills should be improved mainly through practice... The more you read books, the more stupid you become... There are very odd things. When doctors make their rounds they always wear masks no matter what disease they deal with. Are they afraid of contaminating others? I think they are chiefly afraid that others may contaminate them. There must be a different approach! Wearing a mask indiscriminately would only alienate the doctor from the patient... City hospitals should be staffed with doctors with little experience and skill; the rest should be sent to the country."

That Mao is only feebly acquainted with the culture of other nations is obvious enough. Some time back he repeatedly and rather openly showed his ignorance, though perhaps now he regrets it. For instance, in his article *On a New Democracy* he asked that his judgements on the question of culture and education be considered "isolated successes out of clumsy attempts at solving the question." True, he is quite well-versed in one specific field of culture—versification in the classical literary language which is comprehensible only to a few. Mao read Chinese classical writings while working in the Peking public library together with Professor Li Ta-chao, later one of the founders of the CPC. [In 1967, Li Ta-chao's son, Li Pao-hua, was tortured by hungweipings on Mao's order.] It is significant that as the persecution of intellectuals became more intense, the Chairman's verses were extolled more and more fervently. The literary magazine *Wensye Pinglun* declared even before the "cultural revolu-

tion" started: "Such classical poems could be written only by a great leader of proletarian revolution such as Chairman Mao."

ONSLAUGHT AGAINST WORLD CULTURE

In 1956, as said earlier, the 8th All-China Congress of the CPC, in outlining a programme of genuine cultural revolution in China, proclaimed: "It is necessary to know and master all that is useful in the past culture of our country and the culture of foreign countries." Ten years later the architects of the current "great proletarian cultural revolution" demonstrated to the whole world the way they "creatively" master foreign culture. Here are some examples of their "refined" approach. It appears that "the ultimate social ideal reflected in Victor Hugo's works is... the strengthening of the bourgeois society... Victor Hugo took the position of a bourgeois seeking to preserve the capitalist order." Balzac was "an advocate of reactionary humanitarianism. The ways of reforming society, suggested by him are ridiculous and erroneous." The "bourgeois music" of Beethoven can only "paralize revolutionary will."

Despite their offensive against world culture and art, the Maoists jauntily call themselves the "only true Marxist-Leninists." They try to convince the masses that Marx, Engels and Lenin held the same views as theirs. On orders from Mao and his group publishing houses in China have lately stopped putting out works by Marx, Engels and Lenin, except for small collections of

specially selected and tendenciously interpreted passages taken out of context. The Chinese people thus have no way of getting to know what these classics of Marxism have to say on culture and cultural development.

The Maoists, as said earlier, call Balzac an advocate of reactionary humanitarianism, whereas Marx put Balzac above all novelists. Engels wrote that from Balzac's works he learned more about French society that from the books of specialists.[1]

The magazine *Jenmin Inyueh* said (No.12, 1964): "Beethoven's dreams cannot be our dreams; the sound of his music cannot be the sound of our epoch." In 1965, *Kuangming Jihpao* carried an article in which the author confessed that "Beethoven's symphonies demoralized him." The Chinese press is filled with such statements, which are presented in a way which suggest that they fully coincide with the views on musical culture contained in the classics of Marxism.

At the conference of music and dance workers, held in Peking in early 1964, three principles were proclaimed as the basis for "a new course" in music and dance: "nationalism," "massification" and "revolutionization." This is how musical critic Huan Yu-kuei defined the task: "To revolutionize music it is necessary, above all, to revolutionize content. This means that the content of a musical work must reflect and stimulate class struggle, production effort and scientific experiment. . ., it must *help promote* the revolutionary struggle of the peoples throughout the world."

---

[1] *Marx and Engels on Art*, Moscow, Iskusstvo Publishing House, Vol. I, p. 7.

Thus the tasks of musical culture are virtually watered down and reduced to direct political propaganda of the "special course" of the Mao group.

Particularly revealing is the Maoists' attitude to Russian and Soviet culture which they brand as "revisionist." On June 4, 1966, on the eve of the "great proletarian cultural revolution," *Jenmin Jihpao* said: "Reaction slanderously declares that we 'are stifling culture.' Such rotten culture as imperialist and contemporary-revisionist culture must not only be stifled but destroyed."

In 1960, in connection with the 50th anniversary of the death of Leo Tolstoy, the Maoist "cultural workers" went so far as to say that to admire Tolstoy means *to support the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence.* According to the Maoists, to admire Soviet writers is an even greater sin. The chief army paper *Tsefang Tsunpao* warned on April 18, 1966 that "the best Soviet works of fiction [mind you, *the best—B.B.*] require an analytical approach. They must not be worshipped, and particularly not blindly imitated."

The Maoists seem to have set themselves the task of breaking all records of obscurantism. They call for "...exposing and attacking the concepts of literature and art held by the Russian bourgeois literary critics, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov." Strange as it might seem, these words indeed appeared in the chief organ of the Chinese press.

The whole world knows that Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov had never been "bourgeois literary critics," but great revolutionary democrats. Theirs was the most revolutionary, the most progressive thought for their time. It is only

the cultural illiterates who could think of "exposing" these writers.

"Chernyshevsky," wrote Marx in his *Essays of Political Economy*, "masterfully showed the bankruptcy of bourgeois political economy."[1] Is this what the Maoists want to "expose"? Marx noted further: "I would like to publish something about Chernyshevsky's life, personality, etc., in order to arouse sympathy for him in the West."[2] "I speak of the great Russian scholar and critic [Chernyshevsky] with great respect which he deserves,"[3] wrote Marx in one of his letters. Marx's great respect for Chernyshevsky apparently means nothing to the Maoists who call themselves "true Marxists."

Engels called Nikolai Chernyshevsky "a great thinker" to whom Russia owed a great deal.[4] "The country," Engels wrote, "that has produced two writers of the calibre of Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky—two socialist Lessings—is not bound to perish..."[5] But Engels is no longer an authority to the Maoists. In time they will probably also dub him a "bourgeois literary critic" and call for "exposing" his views.

The Maoists are not the first to attack Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Belinsky. Their predecessors were members of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie who in their magazine *Vekhi* ("Milestones") called Chernyshevsky and Belinsky "leaders of intellectuals" divorced from the people. In rebuffing these views Lenin pointed out that

---

[1] *Marx and Engels on Art*, Vol. I, p. 498.
[2] Ibid., p. 504.
[3] Ibid., p. 498.
[4] Ibid., p. 498.
[5] Ibid., p. 497.

what distinguished Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Belinsky from others were their "profound, indissoluble links with the people and their liberation struggle" and their "progressive ideas." Lenin wrote that "...the *role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.* To have a concrete understanding of what this means, let the reader recall such predecessors of Russian Social-Democracy as Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky."[1]

Nadezhda Krupskaya—Lenin's wife and associate—recalled that Lenin "admired the entire personality of Chernyshevsky." "...As a personality, Chernyshevsky impressed Vladimir Ilyich with his irreconcilability, his staunchness, and the dignity and pride with which he endured the unbelievable hardships alloted to him by fate."[2] [Chernyshevsky spent some twenty years in prison and in a hard labour camp under unbearable conditions—*B.B.*] Lenin spoke highly of Chernyshevsky as a great thinker and philosopher who from the 1850s on until his death remained true to philosophical materialism. Lenin repeatedly pointed out the significance of Chernyshevsky's steadfast, irreconcilable and passionate struggle against Russian liberalism. Persons who knew Lenin told how Lenin loved and knew thoroughly Chernyshevsky's remarkable socio-philosophical novel *What Is To Be Done?* which had a powerful impact on many generations of revolutionaries in Russia as well as other countries [including China—*B.B.*] In reply to the sceptical comments

[1] Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 5, p. 370.

[2] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, Progress Publishers, p. 239.

on the novel by Valentinov, a Menshevik, Lenin said "Do you realize what you are talking about? ...Hundreds of people became revolutionaries under its influence... It carried away my brother, just as it carried away me. It deeply ploughed me all up. This is a thing that gives a lifelong charge... Before getting acquainted with the works of Marx, Engels and Plekhanov it was only Chernyshevsky that had the main, overwhelming influence on me, and it all started with *What Is To Be Done?* Chernyshevsky's greatest merit is that he not only showed that every upright and truly decent man should be a revolutionary but something else, even more important: what the makings of a revolutionary are, what his principles should be, and how he should advance towards his goal, by what methods and means to strive for it..."[1]

Nadezhda Krupskaya wrote "...Everything Vladimir Ilyich says of Chernyshevsky is imbued with deep respect for his memory."[2]

In August 1918, at the height of the Civil War in Russia, Lenin signed a decree on building monuments to Chernyshevsky in Moscow and other towns. Such was the high regard Lenin had for the great revolutionary democrat whom the Maoists call "a bourgeois critic" who should be "exposed." But in doing so they only expose their own ignorance and their anti-Marxist nihilism.

The question arises: why such hatred for the revolutionary democrats Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Belinsky? The reason may be found in the writings of Mao Tse-tung, in his wrong

[1] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, pp. 649-650, 651-652.
[2] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, Progress Publishers, p. 239.

philosophy and his "directives." Mao has ruled that all true culture is to be rejected, as well as the teachings of Marx and Lenin. An editorial in *Jenminh Jihpao* of June 11, 1966 stated: "The teaching of Mao Tse-tung represents the summit of Marxism-Leninism of our epoch... The theory and practice of Comrade Mao Tse-tung embody the objective and absolute truth." The so-called ideas of Mao Tse-tung are proclaimed the ideological basis of the Rules for the new nationalist party of China, adopted at the "9th Congress." It seems that truth can come only from Mao. Marx and Lenin are no longer necessary, as well as the forerunners of Russian Social-Democracy—Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Belinsky, whose ideas had, in fact, influenced all democratic, revolutionary writers and artists in China.

Worth noting here is Lenin's view of Tolstoy. Though Lenin pointed out weaknesses in Tolstoy's philosophy he highly valued Tolstoy as a writer, as an artist. Gorky recalled the following words Lenin said about Tolstoy:

"'What a rock, eh? What a giant of a man! Now that, my friend, is an artist... And do you know another amazing thing? Before this Count there was no authentic muzhik in literature.'

"And then, looking at me with his little eyes screwed up, he asked:

"'Who, in Europe, can be ranked with him?'

"And answered himself: 'No one.'"[1]

Lenin noted that Tolstoy's creative work was a powerful indictment of old Russia. "His universal significance as an artist and his universal fame as a thinker and preacher reflect, each in

[1] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, Progress Publishers, p. 246.

its own way, the universal significance of the Russian revolution... Tolstoy... succeeded in rising to such heights of artistic power that his works rank among the greatest in world literature. The epoch of preparation for revolution in one of the countries under the heel of the serfowners became, thanks to its brilliant illumination by Tolstoy, a step forward in the artistic development of humanity as a whole... Tolstoy not only produced artistic works which will always be appreciated and read by the masses, once they have created human conditions of life for themselves after overthrowing the yoke of the landlords and capitalists, he succeeded in conveying with remarkable force the moods of the large masses that are oppressed by the present system, in depicting their condition and expressing their spontaneous feelings of protest and anger."[1] One of the highest tributes to Tolstoy's legacy is contained in these words by Lenin: "This heritage is accepted and is being worked upon by the Russian proletariat."[2]

Lenin called Tolstoy "the mirror of the Russian revolution" and considered his creative work "a step forward in the artistic development of humanity as a whole." The Maoist "cultural workers," on the other hand, reject Tolstoy's works, describing them as "a blow to the militant spirit of communism." Still this does not prevent them from calling themselves "true Marxist-Leninists." Obviously, they are counting on the ignorance of their audience. But it is not so easy to conceal the truth. The real reason for the Maoists' hatred for Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Tolstoy, Balzac and

---

[1] Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 16, pp. 323-324.
[2] Ibid., p. 327.

other classics of world literature is that the works of these writers teach people to cherish truth. But truth is anathema to the Maoists.

DESTRUCTION OF CULTURE, MAOIST STYLE

The Maoists have their own recipes for the development of art and literature. They were announced by the army paper *Chiefangchiun pao* (April 18, 1966) in its editorial entitled "Hold Aloft the Great Red Banner of the Ideas of Mao Tse-tung, Take an Active Part in the Great Socialist Cultural Revolution." "To develop a new socialist literature and art," declare Maoist generals, "it is necessary to create... good examples." Surely a profound thought. But who are to create these "good examples"? The clue to the question is provided by the "great helmsman": "Life, as reflected in works of literature and art, can and must appear loftier, brighter, more concentrated, typical and ideal, which means, more comprehensive than everyday reality." Who can doubt that generals and colonels will exert themselves and in due time create such "more concentrated" and "typical" works? Here is another recipe: "The socialist cultural revolution is attended by destruction and creation. Genuine creation is inconceivable without *complete destruction.*" In other words, all literature and art are to be completely destroyed before "good examples" can be created. Such attitude contradicts the Leninist view of cultural heritage. Lenin differentiated between bourgeois and democratic culture. He was opposed to bourgeois culture, but stood for the preservation

and development of the democratic culture of the past.

"The *elements* of democratic and socialist culture," Lenin wrote, "are present, if only in rudimentary form, in *every* national culture, since in *every* nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But *every* nation also possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary and clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of 'elements,' but of the *dominant* culture."[1]

The Maoists hold a different view. They call for attacks against the views on literature held by Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov "who were bourgeois democrats living in tsarist Russia, and whose ideology was bourgeois and not Marxist." The army paper continued: "We want to pass on the weapon of literary-artistic criticism to the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, and to link up professional critics with critics from among the masses... It is necessary to improve literary style, to write more brief articles understandable to all, and to turn literary and artistic criticism into a kind of dagger and grenade, in other words, to 'master the art of close fighting.' " One can well imagine such "close fighting" in which "critics" resort to daggers and grenades...

So "old culture" is to be done away with immediately and completely, and replaced with a "new culture." But who is to provide criteria for judging the "correctness" of the new cultural values, if they exist at all? Mao Tse-tung, of course.

---

[1] Lenin. *Col. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 24.

Only he is the "embodiment of truth, the hope of the people, the greatest genius of our epoch, the great saviour of the peoples of the whole world, the reddest sun, the highest supreme commander."

The "reddest sun" displays a rather peculiar concern for Chinese culture and intellectuals. In 1956, he launched a nation-wide campaign under the slogan "May a hundred flowers blossom, may a thousand schools contend." This ill-fated campaign came to be known as the "campaign of a hundred flowers." Its aim was to work out a new policy with regard to intellectuals, to "surround them with care and attention," etc. The "reddest sun" publicly declared then: "Many of our comrades cannot rally the intellectuals, show a tough attitude towards them, do not respect their work, and allow unjustified interference in their scientific and cultural work."[1] Those turned out to be words only. As soon as "a hundred flowers" began to blossom a campaign of baiting was launched against intellectuals who "thought otherwise," who believed Mao's promises and sincerely stated their dissatisfaction with the state of culture and science in the country.

During the short-lived "hundred flowers" movement [it lasted less than a year] Chinese intellectuals unburdened their heart. Hsu Yi-kuan said: "Beginning from 1952, one campaign followed another, each leaving behind a gigantic wall isolating one group of people from another. In such conditions no one dared to express his feelings even within a narrow circle of close friends,

---

[1] Mao Tse-tung. *Concerning a Correct Solution of Contradictions Among the People*, Moscow, 1957, p. 28.

let alone speaking out publicly. Now everybody in China knows how to dissemble. What a person says is one thing, and what he thinks is another." [1] Eventually, these words were paid for with blood. Among the victims were also those who doubted the sincerety of such "gracious permission" to speak one's mind. Historian Chian Po-tsan was one of them. He said that intellectuals wanted to know if "the loosening of the control was a sincere step or a shrewd manoeuvre; if this represented a goal to be fought for honestly or was just a trap; if it was aimed at enriching culture and science or at sounding out sentiments".[2] No luckier was a librarian of the Shanghai University who said: "We were full of joy when Chairman Mao again raised the question of the free expression of opinion. But we are still apprehensive. Today I can say whatever I want. But is it possible that after a while, say, in a year or two, my words will be used against me?"[3] Of course, one would hate to be in the librarian's shoes now.

The "hundred flowers" were soon to be plucked out in keeping with Mao's new directives: "Artists and writers in China... should sincerely and wholeheartedly stay for long periods of time in the very midst of the masses... before taking up creative work." And so they did. Artists and writers, musicians and philosophers, post-graduates and students—in their thousands—went, or more precisely, were sent to dig canals and plough up virgin soil, to operate village furnaces casting iron of very poor quality. The entire Philosophy Department of the Peking University

[1] *Chuangming Jihpao* June 5, 1957
[2] *Jenmin Jihpao*, April 20, 1957.
[3] *Chuangming Jihpao*, May 10, 1957.

spent a whole year doing farm work as a punishment for their "ideological mistakes." The youth paper *Chungo Tsinyan Pao* carried an article on January 19, 1965 about a student of the Kwanchow University who spent seven years in a village near Peking collecting manure.

AMATEURS IN PLACE OF PROFESSIONALS

Some intellectuals are allowed to work but not before they have gone through the humiliating process of "self-criticism" which sometimes involves physical assault. Those interminable "self-criticism" meetings are something between a trial by ordeal and a gathering of fanatical self-torturers. A Chinese intellectual who has been "reeducated" in this way would never dare to think for himself again. Neither would he publicly question Mao's views. But at any rate he is no longer trusted by the Maoists. The need arises for qualitatively different intellectuals, i.e., intellectuals from among hungweipings and tsaofans who would set to work to master science with Mao's book of quotations in their hands, zealously burn "bourgeois" and "revisionist" books, and engage in "artistic creation" in their spare time.

There exists collection of articles entitled *The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China.* In it is stated: "We must make sure... that the army plays a major role in the field of literature and art." It is of course ridiculous that soldiers are assigned the task of "advancing" culture, art and science.

The method of a certain farmer "uncle" Chiang Yun-kang was widely publicized as an example of peasants' "revolutionary creative work" in agriculture. This method, "three yellow and three black," was *officially* acknowledged as *the only correct method* of applying fertilizers on rice paddies.[1] There were cases of peasants and soldiers "taking part" in nuclear research. "Research in nuclear science," proclaimed *Jenmin Jihpao*, "should not be the privelege of a selected few. It does not require long training. Such research can be carried out by the broad masses and within shorter periods of time."[2] Writing in *Jenmin Jihpao* a high-ranking official of Hungan Province claimed: "Those with a lower cultural development are better people than those with a higher education... Professional scholars blindly worship foreigners, and never dare to do things which have not already been done abroad..."[3]

Maoist ideologists also came up with a "theory" explaining why creative work should not be done by professionals. Art, they claim, was born among the masses, but with the emergence of classes it was usurped by a minority. When classes are liquidated and the differences between manual and mental labour disappear under communism, literature and art will cease to be "in the hands of a minority." The Maoist ideologists contend that the first steps are being made in present-day China towards a "return" of literature and art to the masses. People having no professional training— "amateur" writers, poets, artists, mu-

---

[1] *Jenmin Jihpao*, March 22, 1962.
[2] *Jenmin Jihpao*, September 28, 1958.
[3] *Jenmin Jihpao*, June 30, 1958.

sicians, etc.,—are "extensively involved" in literature and art, they report triumphantly.

Maoist critics discerned "serious errors" in the magazine *Wen-i pao* arising from the fact that it was put out by professionals. There have been many comments of this kind.

Lately this question was posed somewhat differently by the Maoists. In 1958, they linked the "return of literature and art to the majority of the people" to the liquidation of classes in communist society, which was supposed to take place in China in three or four years. Now, frightened by the disastrous "leap," they have postponed the emergence of communism in China for several hundred years. On top of this, Mao Tse-tung and his group now expound the thesis that with the advancement to socialism and communism class struggle will become sharper. They claim that this struggle will take place in a communist society, too. The liquidation of professional art is now considered part of this struggle.

Such views are actually the result of a misunderstanding by the Chinese theorists of the Marxist proposition concerning the elimination of differences between manual and mental labour. According to the Maoists, this process of elimination does not involve raising the cultural level of the masses to that of the professionals. On the contrary, to them it means lowering the cultural level of the professionals to that of the workers by hand who have had no education. It is understandable that the implementation of such a "concept," or even an attempt to do so, would only lead to cultural impoverishment and the preservation of the state of cultural backwardness

among the masses. In fact, this is what has been happening in China in recent years.

There is no question that with the advancement towards communism, in the process of all-round construction of a socialist society (not after the Chinese pattern, of course), the cultural, aesthetic and education standards of people will rise steadily. More and more people will take an active part in the country's cultural development. But it is likewise certain that in an advanced socialist or communist society differentiation of labour will remain. There will be then, as there are today, professional writers, poets, artists, musicians, film directors, cameramen, actors, etc. Otherwise, cultural standards would become much lower. New trails in art will inevitably be blazed mainly by gifted professionals devoting all their energy and talent to their favourite work. The task, therefore, is to provide them with the best conditions for creative work.

There is a crying contradiction between the views of the Maoists and those of Lenin with regard to creative professionalism. In speaking of the famous Soviet poet Demyan Bedny, whom he valued highly, Lenin nevertheless found it necessary to note: "He's a bit crude. He follows the reader whereas he should be a little ahead of him."[1]

In China, the artists are constantly asked to "come down to the level of ordinary people," instead of being ahead of them. But the value of a creative work of art—whether a story, a painting, an actor's interpretation of a role, or a concerto—lies precisely in the fact that it reveals to

[1] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, p. 643.

the masses what is new and beautiful and enriches them aesthetically and intellectually.

Lenin pointed out that there can be no development of a new culture without intellectuals. To think otherwise would be to fall into harmful sectarian theorizing. This should serve as an answer to the Maoist claim that culture can be developed not by intellectuals, but by peasants and soldiers. Lenin's conception of the role of intellectuals in cultural advancement is clearly shown in his comments on an article by V. Pletnyov, one of the leaders of the Proletkult. [This was a cultural organization that existed during the first years of Soviet power. Its leaders, like the present-day Maoists, vulgarized and distorted Marxism.] In the margins of the article in which Pletnyov proclaimed: "The task of building a proletarian culture can be accomplished *only* by the proletariat itself," Lenin noted the word "only" and wrote: "Archfiction".[1] He was against the publication of this article: "Now, why print stupidities in the guise of the article by Pletnyov, who puts on pompous airs with all the learned and fashionable words he can?... The author has to learn not 'proletarian' science, but simply to learn... Why, this is *falsification* of historical materialism! Playing at historical materialism!"[2] The task, Lenin said, was not "to *invent* a new proletarian culture, but to *develop* the best samples, traditions, results of the *existing* culture on the basis of a Marxist world outlook."[3] Pletnyov's idea that "the proletarian artists will be

---

[1] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, p. 573. Russ. Ed.
[2] Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 35, p. 554.
[3] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, Russ. Ed. p. 469.

both artists and workers" was described by Lenin as "nonsense".[1]

"The author has to learn not 'proletarian' science, but simply to learn... Why, this is *falsification* of historical materialism!" These words of the great Lenin can well be addressed to Mao Tse-tung and his group. But, alas, learning can hardly do them any good now, though they need it badly.

With regard to nuclear physics and other applied sciences, Peking has been compelled to give up its propaganda about "people's creative effort." The Maoists realized that they could gain nothing politically by continuing such propaganda which did much harm to the country's scientific research efforts. Of late, China has been laying particular emphasis on nuclear research and atomic weaponry production. This is one of the few branches of science that have escaped the "purifying" influence of the "cultural revolution." In this field the Maoists prefer to have not soldiers—"innovators," but world-famed scientists. *Jenmin Jihpao* said, for instance: "The entire technical personnel should be treated as equals... With regard to staffing key posts in the technical field, preference should be given to representatives of the technical intelligentsia. All problems of science and technology must be decided by specialists, above all." Something almost amounting to heresy is allowed here. Thus the paper went on: "The scientific and technical personnel must fight for truth more daringly and uphold their views if they are correct."

But all this applies to those working in the field

[1] *Lenin on Literature and Art*, pp. 576-577, Russ. Ed.

of the applied sciences only. With regard to workers in literature and art, Mao's directives remain the last word.

A certain Cheng Jeng-chia, writing in *Kuangming Jihpao*, cited an example of "incorrect teaching in a conservatory." In discussing the works of Tchaikovsky, a student compared him with Hsi Hsing-hai (a Chinese composer of the 1930's and 1940's—*B.B.*) and called both great composers. The instructor corrected the student. "Are we not instilling in our students a worship for the West?" bemoaned Cheng Jeng-chia. It should be mentioned that this article appeared on March 18, 1964, at a time when the wind of "the great proletarian cultural revolution" was not blowing yet. One wonders what is the fate of the instructor who "corrected" the student (probably in a very cautious manner) and helped him realize that there was some distance between Tchaikovsky and Hsi Hsing-hai—a talented composer who died prematurely? Is this instructor in prison or being "reeducated"?

Lately many "revolutionary" critical articles have appeared in *Kuangming Jihpao*, all containing the same theme: "To write about a young man who, captivated by the beauty of the heroine, wanted to give her his heart (in present-day China one's heart can be given only to Mao Tse-tung—*B.B.*) means to renounce all principles of morality. Such unbridled passion is indecent; it must be curbed."[1] This is fully in accordance with the "teaching of Chairman Mao," who once declared: "A true love for man is possible only after classes are abolished throughout the world."

[1] *Kuangming Jihpao*, September 3, 1963.

In contrast with the steady development of literature and art in the socialist countries, the Chinese people are being crammed with Mao's quotations. The Mao-style art is designed to stupefy the masses.

The political situation in China remains uncertain. A regime might be established that would rely for support not on the working class, the toiling peasantry or the Marxist intelligentsia but on the army, security organs, on the gangs of stupefied hungweipings and tsaofans. A great danger is hovering over the Chinese revolution and the socialist gains of the Chinese people.

It is to be hoped that the great Chinese people will be able to get the country out of this dangerous crisis. But a hard battle is ahead. In this battle a major role will be played by China's progressive intellectuals.

LU HSUN VERSUS THE MAOISTS

In their struggle against the Communist Party of China, people's power, and socialist culture and literature, the Mao Tse-tung group seeks to exploit the name of the great Lu Hsun, but their attempts prove an utter failure. For Lu Hsun's ideas, writings, his public and political activity are directed against persons and ideas such as the Maoists and Maoism.

In 1968, the Maoists set up the notorious "revolutionary committees" all over China headed by so-called new revolutionary leaders. Judging by various reports from the local press, these "leaders" are in most cases unprincipled careerists, hard-hearted and ruthless persons. Using re-

volutionary phrases and quotations from Mao they commit acts of arbitrariness, persecute true Communists and treat people with scorn. In his works Lu Hsun exposed precisely such pseudo-revolutionaries.

"I am profoundly distrustful of people who call themselves 'leaders,'" wrote Lu Hsun, "because I learn from experience that most of these people, putting on the robe of revolutionaries and lavishly tacking on others such horrible labels as 'renegade,' 'counter-revolutionary' or 'traitor' are following a wrong path. They expertly smash the revolutionary forces of the nation and regard the revolutionary camp as their own domain, without caring for the interests of the masses."[1] These are timely words today.

In every issue of *Jenmin Jihpao, Chiefang-chiun pao*, and other Chinese papers the Maoists take great pains to prove how "revolutionary" they are. They deride "economism," i.e., the Chinese people's desire for a better life. They attack "individualism"—man's desire to feed and clothe his family, to have a shelter and give an education to his children. They invent all sorts of "isms" in order to attack the natural aspirations of the people.

The Mao Tse-tung group and its propaganda machine incessantly call for destroying old culture, old literature, old art, old customs and morals and family life. In short, they call for destroying everything. Lu Hsun once wrote: "Of course, a revolution calls for destruction, but still

---

[1] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 6, p. 432, Peking, 1957-59.

more insistently it calls for creation... and this is a very painstaking job."[1]

In making provocative calls for class struggle in a socialist society, for general destruction, the Maoists have exposed themselves as pseudo-revolutionaries and adventurists. The great Lu Hsun ridiculed such pseudo-revolutionaries and adventurists in one of his famous characters Ah Q. In reply to critics who said that Ah Q. was not typical, Lu Hsun wrote: "I think that the Ah Q. type revolutionaries are still to come. I would like to believe those who say that I have depicted something from a remote past or a temporary phenomenon. But I am afraid that what I envision is not so much what is taking place at present as what will happen in the future, possibly in twenty-thirty years."[2] The foresight shown here is truly remarkable. Indeed, thirty years have passed since Lu Hsun wrote these words and the Ah Q. type revolutionaries, i.e., the Maoists, are now committing atrocities in China, persecuting true Communists and humiliating people.

Now that famous Chinese writers are being slandered and literature is being replaced with primitive propaganda, the following quotations from Lu Hsun are more timely than ever:

"At present there can be no writers who are not at the same time intellectuals..."[3]

"I consider that every kind of literature can rightly be called propaganda, but not every kind of propaganda is literature. Apart from slogans, posters, advertisements, telegrams, text-books

---

[1] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 188.
[2] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 282-283.
[3] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 10, p. 140.

and so on, the revolution makes use of fiction literature precisely because it is fiction."[1]

"Works... in which the moral derives from the development of the author's thoughts are all right with me, but if the author begins with calling himself a propagandist and then starts moralizing, nothing good will come of his works. To appreciate them would be as difficult as to appreciate the old moralizing literature."[2]

Having abandoned Marxism-Leninism and openly pursuing a jingoistic course, the Mao Tse-tung group is smearing whatever is associated with the Soviet Union. The Maoists are besmirching the very word "Soviet," doing their best to discredit it in the people's eyes. At the same time, they loudly hail the "ideas" of Mao, which supposedly embody all wisdom and refute the experience of the Soviet Union.

Today most people realize what Mao's "thought" is. It means a "big leap" that has hurled back China's economy and caused a famine which has taken millions of lives. It means "people's communes" which are a vulgarization of the Marxist-Leninist theory of collective agriculture. It means the notorious "cultural revolution" aimed at destroying the Communist Party, the organs of people's power, and the socialist gains of the Chinese people. The Maoists' haughty disregard of the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and their indoctrination of the people with "Maoism" have already done incalculable harm to China. Here, too, Lu Hsun's foresight appears striking.

---

[1] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 68.
[2] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 7, p. 190.

This is how Lu Hsun satirized the self-complacency and chauvinism of phrase-mongers, the predecessors of Maoists. "People today have very weak nerves," said Lu Hsun referring to Kuomintang writers. "As soon as they hear the word Russian they lose heart. Red colour is soon to be banned even on the lips..." This was written more than thirty years ago. Today it may be applied to Mao and his henchmen who have inherited chauvinistic ideas from Kuomintang men and slander whatever is Soviet or Russian. Even the noblest slogans, Lu Hsun once wrote, when they were uttered by "Left-wing" phrase-mongers, tended to become a growl: "Revolution, r-revolution, r-r-revolution, r-r-r..."[1] Or: "The words 'hit' or 'kill' seem, at first glance, truly very revolutionary, but if there is no enemy whatsoever before their author... they sound as the senseless beat of the drum."[2] Lu Hsun pointed out that "a proletarian revolution was carried out not for the sake of killing but for liberating the working people and liquidating classes in general."[3] He was strongly opposed to those who "depicted the revolution as something horrible, malicious, ultra-leftist bringing death to all non-revolutionaries."[4]

These words of Lu Hsun may serve today as a powerful weapon in the struggle against the Maoists. Whereas Lu Hsun said that the purpose of revolution was to liquidate classes, Mao and his followers claim that class struggle will con-

[1] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 3, p. 398.
[2] Ibid., p. 408.
[3] Lu Hsun. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 234.
[4] Ibid., p. 234.

tinue and even become sharper in a socialist society. According to Lu Hsun revolution brings life to the people, not death. The Maoists, on the other hand, are subjecting thousands of people to persecution and harassment, all in the name of revolution. This is taking place in a socialist country, and the victims of the terror are some of the country's most dedicated Communists.

Lu Hsun's outlook is completely opposed to Maoism. Lu Hsun upheld humanitarianism; the Maoists mock it. Lu Hsun studied the best works of world literature. He admired and propagandized it; the Maoists begrime it in every way possible and burn the best works of foreign writers. Lu Hsun raised aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism; the Maoists hoisted the banner of chauvinism. Lu Hsun was an exponent of Soviet culture in China; the Maoists are seeking to eradicate the influence of Soviet culture in the country. Lu Hsun respected the individual. He dreamed of and fought for the emancipation of the individual; the Maoists are openly opposed to the individual, to any independent thought and independent creative effort. They praise persons like Lei Feng, stupefied ascetics, forever pledging their loyalty to Mao Tse-tung. Lu Hsun wrote: "It often happens in China that egoism, individualism and the individual are demolished at one stroke. Moreover, people who do it think they stand on the firm ground of historical materialism. It would be very bad if historical materialism is judged by the doings of such men."[1]

The Maoists are trying to blacken the names of almost all the well-known modern Chine-

[1] Lu Hsun, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 100.

se writers and artists. Lu Hsun is one of the few exceptions. Why? Because he is too great and so popular in China that the Maoists know they cannot easily condemn him. Instead, they use his name and works for their evil ends. In doing so the Maoists attribute to the giant of Chinese literature things which he never wrote or said.

In this the Maoists follow their pet pattern: repeating one and the same thing ten, a hundred, a thousand times so that the people may come to believe it. At a meeting held in Peking on October 31, 1966 to mark the 85th anniversary of Lu Hsun's birth and 30th anniversary of his death, the speakers tried to portray the writer as a one-hundred percent Maoist, a kind of Lei Feng in literature. Understandably, no one at the meeting quoted, more or less coherently, any of Lu Hsun's statements or passages from his works. No one would dare to do so. But, apparently, it was quite permissible to insult the memory of the great writer. In a high-flown speech Kuo Mo-jo highly praised Lu Hsun. But it is known that Kuo Mo-jo was one of the leaders of a literary association which baited Lu Hsun, calling him a "remnant of feudalism," "thrice a loafer," and even a "discontented fascist." A more hypocritical speech than Kuo's at this meeting could hardly be imagined.

Lu Hsun's works and his entire revolutionary activity are in striking contrast with the pseudo-popular, counter-revolutionary "theories" of Maoism. This is a truth which cannot be destroyed or distorted by the Peking falsifiers. What Lu Hsun stood for is contrary to Maoism. This is clear to all who has read his works.

Maoism and Maoist "concepts" of culture are

alien to many other noted Chinese writers, poets, artists, musicians, cinema and theatre figures. The attempts of the Maoists to create their own culture have dismally failed. Not a single remarkable work of art has been created in China during the past few years. This is logically enough—Maoist culure is the anti-thesis of genuine culture.

OUTCOME OF SLANDEROUS PROPAGANDA

The hungweiping movement has revealed to the whole world the horror resulting from the Maoist way of educating the Chinese young people. The outrages of the "Red Guards" have no limits. The French magazine *Expresse* carried an evewitness account by Claude Gour about the doings of the hungweipings. "In one of the suburbs of Peking," Gour wrote, "I saw five squatting old people—three men and two women. Each had on the chest a poster with the word 'reactionary' written on it. Nearby stood hungweipings, holding belts in their hands. They forced the old folks to pluck grass. A youngster of fifteen or so scolded an old man for not working fast enough and hit him with the belt."

How can all this happen in China with its long traditions of respect for old people? The answer is simple enough: this results from the way the young people are educated in China today. The vicious Maoist propaganda has poisoned the minds of millions of young people. The Maoist attacks on culture and education, science and art also have a good deal to do with it. Ignorance always goes with obscurantism and lawlessness.

The blather of *Chiefangchiun pao*, the gibberish of Lin Piao who called for "uprooting old culture" are not merely nonsense. They are dangerous counter-revolutionary directives. "You can become a Communist only when you enrich your mind with a knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind." These words of Lenin should be kept in mind when considering the notorious "cultural revolution" in China. It is simply ridiculous to call those who burn classical works of literature true revolutionaries and Communists. It is the height of idiocy to say that books make people stupid.

The attacks on culture and science are an inseparable part of the general political course pursued by Mao Tse-tung and his group. This course is characterized, above all, by anti-Sovietism. Take, for example, the case of the noted Chinese economist Sung E-fang. He was charged with "revisionism" because he dared to uphold the principle of material incentive. The frenzied attacks by the Maoists on this important principle of Marxist political economy are no secret today. Neither is it a secret that Mao Tse-tung and his group fully ignore the interests of the Chinese people.

The Maoists hate even to hear about the principle of material incentive. That is why Sung E-fang was put behind bars. Any association with the Soviet Union is enough for professional intellectuals to be attacked by the Maoists. This is understandable. The Soviet example still attracts the Chinese people and their intelligentsia. This explains the Maoists' attempt to smear everything connected with the Soviet Union and to instill in the people hatred for it.

The wildest acts of vandalism with regard to culture were connected with the outrages by the hungweipings and tsaofans, which marked the peak of the "cultural revolution." But what they did was not merely smashing culture, routing professional associations and baiting intellectuals. Their main task was, jointly with the army, to liquidate the Party organizations and constitutional organs of power to ensure the Mao group conditions for a state coup and the establishment of a military-bureaucratic dictatorship in the country. On the whole, this task was accomplished by the hungweipings. But, subsequently, the hungweiping detachments got out of the control of Mao Tse-tung and his henchmen. The outrages of the hungweipings led to growing opposition among the masses. The hungweipings by their actions disrupted production, caused chaos and anarchy in the country and virtually brought it to the verge of civil war. The Peking authorities were compelled to limit gradually the role of the hungweipings and then to remove them from the political scene. Certain "unruly" leaders of these detachments were even punished while millions of rank-and-filers were sent to out-of-the-way villages. But the "Mao Tse-tung Headquarters" did not charge them with crimes against culture. On the contrary, their doings with regard to culture were found "absolutely correct."

Subsequent events prove that the Mao group does not at all regret the "cultural activities" of the hungweipings and even fails to see anything "extreme" about them.

The attacks on culture and cultural workers did not cease with the removal of the hungweipings from the political arena. The removal mere-

ly means that museums are no longer vandalized, books no longer burned and arbitrary trials of writers, artists and composers no longer held. That is all. But the onslaught on culture goes on, though in a somewhat altered form.

Since the second half of 1968 the role of the hungweipings in the "cultural revolution" was taken over by the so-called detachments for propaganda of Mao Tse-tung's ideas. All cultural and educational establishments have been put under the control of these "detachments."

Their task, officially, is to conduct the "reeducation" of intellectuals and ensure "a closer link between the intelligentsia and the masses." But their actual assignment is to discredit the intelligentsia and prevent it from exercising any influence on the education of the younger generation. Facts prove this. The magazine *Hungchi* (No.2, 1968) carried an article by Mao Tse-tung's son-in-law, Yao Fen-yuan. The title of the article is both demagogical and cynical: "The Working Class Must Guide All and Everything." The author wrote: "Workers and PLA soldiers must penetrate places where there is a concentration of intellectuals in order to break up their rule... This would help alter the unhealthy atmosphere, style and aspirations among the intelligentsia..." Turning to Chinese intellectuals and college instructors, that is, those who managed to survive, Yao declared smugly: "It so happens that those who work in the natural and technical sciences do not know how to handle machinery or repair it; teachers of literature do not know how to write, while agrochemistry instructors do not know how to apply fertilizers. The working class is by far superior to myopic intellectuals." This is the same hack-

neyed thesis expounded by Mao, namely, that illiterate "ordinary" people are "better" and "purer" than intellectuals.

It should be obvious to anyone that secondary school teachers, let alone college instructors, cannot be replaced with persons having only two or three years' schooling in the village. Thus the policy towards the intelligentsia in present-day China is both ridiculous and tragic. This barbarous policy of the Maoists, however, is understandable enough. Mao and his "Headquarters" fear intellectuals, and out of fear grows hate. But under certain circumstances the Chinese intelligentsia in alliance with the working class can (and must!) lead the Chinese people in a struggle against the military-bureaucratic dictatorship of the Maoists.

The organization of "propaganda teams" coincided with the introduction of "reform in education" and "reform in public health."

The "reform in education" boils down to drastically reducing the period of schooling. Incidentally, the schools closed in the summer of 1966, did not reopen till the autumn of 1969. School curricula were "basically" revised. Under the new curriculum two-thirds of the classroom time is given to "politics," i.e., reading Mao's articles and utterances. Trained teachers have in most cases been replaced (especially in the rural communities) by "people's teachers"—mostly illiterate or semi-illiterate persons selected on the basis of one criterion, their "loyalty to the ideas of Mao Tse-tung."

The "reform in education" is, as may be expected, based on Mao's "guiding instructions." In

December 1966, addressing the students of the Harbin Engineering Institute, the "great teacher" said: "At present there are too many subjects. They are a torture to the students. No wonder, the students are overworked... The study programme can be cut by half. Confucius used to teach only the six arts: rites, music, archery, chariot-driving, book of divination and arithmetics. Now, there are many subjects and books, too. The strain on the students is just a bit too much. Certain subjects should be removed from the curriculum. It's enough if the students know what grammar is."

The effect of the notorious "reform in education" made itself felt pretty soon. One press report (October, 1968) of the situation in the schools of a village commune in Chanchiang Province goes as follows: "Inspired by the brilliant directive of Chairman Mao, in February of that year the peasants of our commune took over the administration of the schools and reformed the educational system... In half a year they did away with such a phenomenon as the domination of intellectuals in the schools. More than 700 criticism meetings were held in the commune in a little over six months. The poor and middle-income peasants strongly criticized such principles of the old educational system as the 'priority of intellectual training' or 'excellent marks above all'. Under the pernicious influence of such system many students paid attention only to books, and they had only marks on their mind. *The more they read, the more stupid they became.*" No comment is necessary here.

Another "great reform" was in the field of public health. It was also ordered by Mao Tse-

tung. It should be recalled that as early as March 17, 1967 the newspaper of Peking medical workers published Mao's "thoughts" concerning the reorganization of the country's medical education. As quoted above, Mao declared then: "It is not necessary that medical schools accept only graduates of secondary or incomplete secondary schools. Three years of training is enough for primary school graduates. Skills should be improved mainly through practice."

This directive, of course, was immediately put into effect. Under the "great reform" most of the doctors of "Western medicine" were declared "bourgeois authorities," "black elements." Tens of thousands of them were sent to out-of-the-way regions for "reeducation." Their new job is to dig ditches, bring fertilizers to the fields, collect firewood, etc. Those doctors of "Western medicine" who have thus far escaped "reeducation" are made to interrupt their practice for several hours every day in order to acquire "true medical knowledge," i.e. in order to study the quotations from the "great helmsman." This is done under the supervision of soldiers from the "detachments for propagandizing Mao Tse-tung's ideas."

Before the working day starts, and before each surgical operation members of these propaganda detachments, billetted in each town hospital and polyclinic, take from doctors and nurses the oath of allegiance to the "great helmsman." After the working day is over, or upon completion of an operation the medical personnel is obliged to render homage to Mao in front of his portrait. All this is called "rectifying the bourgeois style." "Rectifying" is generally preferred by medical workers to "reeducation." Those subjected to the

"rectifying" procedure are usually afraid to be transferred to the "reeducation" category.

Meanwhile, the "wonders" that have supposedly occurred in medicine owing to the directives of the "great helmsman" became downright absurd. On December 3, 1967, Peking Radio announced that as a result of studying Mao's "directives" a general physician at a people's hospital in Chinling Province, who "previously used to handle *only* 200 patients a day, now receives before lunch-time 500 people." In other words, "inspired" by Mao's "ideas" the doctor handles two patients a minute—truly a record of folly and stupidity.

The successful outcome of any complex operation is now attributed exclusively to Mao's "all-conquering teaching." *Jenmin Jihpao* and *Kuangming Jihpao* carried an article about a military hospital in Peking whose personnel "accomplished a wonder in the history of world medicine—a 45-kilogramme tumour was removed from the abdomen of a peasant woman named Chiang Tsu-chai." The operation, which many specialists doubt was actually performed, is described by Chinese papers as "another victory for the ideas of Mao Tse-tung." This "miracle" was immediately used by the Maoists for political ends. On the same day, December 8, the New China News Agency solemnly announced that Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao "approved" the order of the army leadership to confer on the hospital the title of "the foremost." At a ceremonious meeting called in Peking to mark the occasion, the cured Chiang Tsu-chai, according to the New China News Agency, "wrathfully condemned Liu Shao-chi for his crimes and promised to obey the beloved lead-

er Chairman Mao Tse-tung for the rest of her life."

But the "great reform" in China's public health system does not consist merely of "reeducating" and "rectifying" qualified doctors labelled "bourgeois authorities," or of attributing all achievements in medicine—real or imaginary—to the "proper learning of Mao's ideas." The reform now means a drastic cut in the period of training (from five to two or three years) at medical institutes or departments and admission without examinations. Graduates of incomplete secondary schools are required only to present a certificate of their political loyalty to be enrolled in a medical school. Recently the "great reform" has been supplemented with a "system of cooperative treatment" in the countryside.

This "system" is designed to train an "army of people's doctors" from among primary school-leavers. Such "people's doctors" or "barefooted doctors," as they are usually called, have already been sent out to practice medicine. *Jenmin Jihpao* carried an account of how illnesses had been treated with neither doctors nor medicines in the Injuang commune, Hupei Province. It appears that "barefooted doctors" treated their patients primarily with the help of Mao Tse-tung's quotations. The paper cited many instances of the miraculous effect of these quotations on the health of patients, even those who were seriously ill. True, in some cases "barefooted doctors" accompanied by village quacks and occasionally by army feldschers use needle therapy to treat a "hundred diseases."

The "great reform" of Mao Tse-tung in medicine, though obviously ridiculous, pursues far-

reaching political aims. First, under the cover of this "reform" Mao and his accomplices are seeking, at one stroke, to do away with a large segment of the intelligentsia. Second, they could save money by not having to pay the salaries of doctors subjected to "reeducation." Third, the "reform" affords propaganda material for the further deification of the "great helmsman." Fourth, it creates quickly and at little cost ("barefooted doctors" receive no pay, but only food from villagers) the impression that Mao is "greatly concerned" for the health of the peasants.

It should be mentioned, however, that despite the "great reform" and its aims, the "reddest sun" and his henchmen themselves prefer the services of highly qualified and experienced doctors. They have not the slightest intention to be taken care of by army feldschers, not to mention "barefooted doctors."

In carrying out all these "reforms" the Maoists are seeking to do away with China's genuine culture and replace it with a pseudo-culture, sharply to narrow the scope of education, and to deal a crushing blow at the social sciences—all in order to clear the way for the establishment of Maoism as some kind of religion in the country. As for intellectuals and the educated youth, they are being dealt with ruthlessly. They are being "reeducated." How? Simply by turning them into peasants. By the summer of 1969, over 25 million people—intellectuals ("old" and "new"), schoolleavers and dismissed officials—had been sent from towns to remote rural areas.

The Maoists make no secret of the fact that these people were sent to the countryside *for life* to be "reeducated through physical labour." Mil-

lions more are likely to join them. In his "report" to the "9th Party Congress" Lin Piao spoke about Peking's determination to press ahead with "re-education."

From what has been said above it is absolutely clear that Maoism is the antithesis of cultural progress.

Б. БУЛАТОВ

Маоизм против культуры

на английском языке

Цена 2¹ коп